

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-3 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 0 315 365 to Wright in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,777,591 to Katoh et al. (hereinafter Katoh).

Claims 4-6 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright and Katoh as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,907,314 to Negishi et al. (Negishi).

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicant has amended claims 1 and 4 to further define the invention. Accordingly, claims 1-6 remain pending in this application for further consideration.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-3 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright in view of Katoh, and claims 4-6 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright and Katoh as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Negishi. To the extent that the rejections might still apply to the newly amended claims, they are respectfully traversed as being based upon a combination of references that neither teaches nor suggests the novel combination of features now clearly recited in the claims.

With respect to each of independent claims 1 and 4, as newly-amended, Applicant respectfully submits that Wright, Katoh and Negishi, whether taken individually or in

combination, do not teach or suggest a claimed combination including at least the recited feature of “the plurality of first switching devices are positioned at the middle portion of the gate lines.”

The Final Office Action concedes at Section 2 that “Wright does not disclose a plurality of switching devices provided at the gate lines for separating the sub-matrices between the column electrodes,” but relies upon Katoh to allegedly remedy the deficiencies of Wright. The Final Office Action indicates at Page 4, Section 4 that “[a]s shown in Figs. 1, 5, 9 of Katoh, the display panel having a first sub-matrix (first group 28) and a second-matrix (second group 29) between the column electrodes.” Then, the Final Office Action goes on to allege that “Wright as modified by Katoh would have the display panel is separated into two sub-matrices between the row electrodes, and have the plurality of switching devices provided at the gate lines for separating the sub-matrices between the column electrodes and for switching a driving mode of the plurality of cells to either a divisional driving mode or a non-divisional driving mode in column direction as claimed.” Applicant respectfully disagrees.

In contrast to the present invention of newly-amended independent claim 1, Katoh merely discloses two sub-matrixes 28 and 29. Applicant respectfully submits that Katoh fails to teach or suggest that “the plurality of first switching devices are positioned at the middle portion of the gate lines first switching devices in the gate lines” as recited in newly-amended claims 1 and 4. In other words, Katoh fails to teach or suggest the claim feature that the Office concedes is not taught or suggested by Wright. Thus, even if combined, Wright and Katoh fail to teach or suggest this claim feature.

In addition, the Final Office Action does not rely upon Negishi to cure any aspect of the above-noted deficiencies of Wright and Katoh, and Applicant respectfully submits that Negishi cannot remedy those deficiencies of Wright and Katoh.

MPEP § 2143.03 instructs that "[t]o establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. In re Royka, 409 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974)." Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully asserts that newly-amended claims 1 and 4 are not obvious and that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejections of dependent claims 2-3 and 5-6 should also be withdrawn at least because of their respective dependencies upon independent claims 1 and 4.

With no other rejection pending, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-6 are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such as an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: 

Xiaobin You
Reg. No. L0112

Date: September 29, 2005

Customer No. 009629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Tel: 202.739.3000
Fax: 202.739.3001

XY/fdb